

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

				····
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,826	02/27/2002	Frederick L. Hjortsberg	LEAR 0922 PUS	6195
34007	7590 04/20/2004		EXAMINER	
	USHMAN P.C. / LEA	SALVATORE, LYNDA		
1000 TOWN CENTER TWENTY-SECOND FLOOR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SOUTHFIEL	D, MI 48075-1238		1771	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/083,826	HJORTSBERG, FREDERICK L.			
· ·	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Lynda M Salvatore	1771	1		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 29 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica atimely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	y to a ition in		
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.7	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The approriginally set in the final	ion. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without canceliNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	S.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		idered but does NC	T place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•				
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·			
10 ☐ Other:					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments regarding the lack of motivation to combine references is not found persuasive. Specifically, the Examiner maintains that the advantages of powdered binders over aqueous taught by Kohlhammer et al., provides sufficient motivation to employ the powdered binder to bond the polyester reinforcing layers of Rozek et al. With regard to Applicant's argument that the binder of Kohlhammer comprises a second component, the Examiner respectfully points out that Applicant's open claim language does not preclude the existence of additional constituents.

CHERYL A. JUSKA PRIMARY EXAMINER